arXiv:1603.02717v2 [math.DS] 24 Sep 2016

Existence of Rotating Waves on an Infinite Two-Dimensional Lattice of Coupled Phase Equations

Jason J. Bramburger

Department of Mathematics and Statistics
University of Ottawa
Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5
CANADA

September 27, 2016

Abstract

Mathematically, rotating wave solutions to evolution equations have been shown to govern many important biological and chemical processes. Much of the rigorous mathematical investigations of rotating waves rely on the model exhibiting a continuous Euclidean symmetry, which in reality is at best an approximation. Here we investigate the existence of rotationally propagating solutions in a discrete spatial setting, in which typical symmetry methods cannot be applied, thus presenting an unique perspective on rotating waves.

This paper proves the existence of rotating wave solutions to a system of oscillators indexed by the two-dimensional integer lattice with nearest-neighbour coupling. We also present a stability analysis of the infinite-dimensional dynamical system by providing a link with the underlying graph structure of the nearest-neighbour connection topology. In particular it is shown that the stability depends on the Banach space in which the perturbation belongs, something which is entirely unique to infinite-dimensional dynamical systems.

1 Introduction

Over the past few decades it has been shown that there are subtle, but measurable, differences in dynamics between analytic solutions to partial differential equations (PDEs)

and to their discretized counterparts that arise from numerical integrations of the model. For this reason, systems of ordinary differential equations that are formed by the discretization of space in the original PDE have emerged as a notable area of research. This leads to the study of a system of differential equations which lie in between partial differential equations and their numerical schemes, allowing one to retain some of the discrete nature of the numerical scheme while still being able to apply the techniques of continuous time dynamical systems. Systems of this type are often referred to as Lattice Dynamical Systems (LDSs) and in addition to being a prototype for numerical schemes, LDSs arise naturally in various physical settings such as material science, in particular metallurgy, where LDSs have been used to model solidification of alloys [6, 9], chemical reactions [13], optics [14] and biology; particularly with chains of coupled oscillators arising in models of neural networks [11, 12]. LDSs have therefore proven to be an interesting area of research in their own right.

It is well-known that reaction-diffusion PDEs admit solutions which are traveling waves [1, 5], rotating (spiral) waves [8, 27], and scroll waves [2, 26]. Each of these types of waves have important implications on the systems being modelled by the PDE (e.g. spiral waves are precursors to arhythmias in cardiac electrophysiology [4, 19]). It is therefore natural to inquire to which extent LDSs admit similar types of solutions.

Rigorous inspection into traveling waves in one-dimensional LDSs (or chains) has been undertaken by many researchers, most notably Zinner, who simplified the existence of traveling waves in such systems to a fixed point problem [29]. Keener contributed to the literature by investigating propagation failure in lattice systems with a cubic nonlinearity [22] and it was deduced that monotone traveling wave solutions can fail to propagate when the coupling between elements on the lattice is sufficiently weak. This was further extended to traveling waves on two-dimensional lattices by Cahn, Mallet-Paret and Van Vleck in [7] where the authors now show that propagation failure is dependent not only on the strength of coupling between cells, but also on the direction of propagation.

In this paper we continue the inspection of propagating solutions in LDSs, although now turning to the existence of rotating wave solutions on two-dimensional lattices. To achieve this result we study an infinite system of oscillators, each coupled to its four nearest-neighbours. These phase equations take the form

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) = \omega + \sum_{i',j'} H(\theta_{i',j'}(t) - \theta_{i,j}(t)), \tag{1.1}$$

where $\dot{x} = dx/dt$ and $\theta_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to S^1$ for each $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Each oscillator is assumed to be identical and therefore ω is taken to be a real-valued constant. The sum is taken over the four nearest-neighbours of (i,j) in the two-dimensional square lattice: $(i \pm 1, j)$, $(i, j \pm 1)$, and $H : S^1 \to S^1$ is an infinitely differentiable odd coupling function which is assumed to be 2π-periodic and strictly increasing on the interval $(\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$. We seek

solutions of the form $\theta_{i,j}(t) = \omega t + \bar{\theta}_{i,j}$, where each oscillator has the same frequency but differs through the time-independent phase-lag $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$. Using any four cell ring in the lattice as a core, a rotating wave solution of this system is defined so that the phase-lags over concentric rings around this core increase from 0 up to 2π.

Despite there being an extensive body of literature investigating linearly propagating waves through infinite lattice structures [16, 18, 23, 28], little to no work has been done to rigorously extend this theory to rotationally propagating solutions. As mentioned above, it is well-known that the continuum counterpart (reaction diffusion PDEs) admit travelling and rotating waves, and that these are related to Euclidean symmetry [3, 15]. In lattice systems, the symmetries are no longer continuous, and the analysis is therefore more complicated. This work is an attempt to open up the investigation of existence and stability of rotationally propagating solutions through spatially discrete mediums by exploring a system of coupled phase equations indexed by the infinite two-dimensional integer lattice. This is motivated by a reduction to our system of coupled phase equations from spatial discretizations of so-called Lambda-Omega systems, which were first introduced by Howard and Kopell [17] and have gone on to become an archetype for oscillatory behaviour in reaction-diffusion systems. In essence this work is only the beginning of a larger project aimed at giving the existence and properties of rotating waves over spatially discretized media, much like the pioneering work of Scheel achieved in planar partial differential equations [27].

This work also generalizes a result due to Ermentrout and Paullet [24], where it is shown that when restricted to both a finite and square lattice, rotating waves in systems like (1.1) not only exist but are stable. Here we extend the results given by Ermentrout and Paullet by moving to an infinite lattice and show that depending on the Banach space in which the problem is posed on, we may still recover stability of the solution. Moving to an infinite lattice gives insight into what can be expected of the rotating wave solution as the size of the lattice increases, as well as understand its dynamics in the absence of boundary conditions, thus aiding in our understanding of propagation through spatially discrete media.

Rotating wave solutions to differential equations are of great interest because of their relevance to various applications, typically in models of complex biological and chemical processes. For example, in the study of cardiac electrophysiology it has been shown that spiral waves are often precursors to severe or fatal arrhythmias [4, 19]. In a continuous spatial setting these waves are time-periodic solutions of differential equations whose flow in time is given by an action of a rotational symmetry group. The study of rotating and spiral waves is in no way complete and remains an active area of research throughout the physical sciences. Here we will expand on the theory of rotating waves by moving into a spatially discretized domain stemming from PDE models.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we provide a reduction to our model

from a system of coupled oscillators governed by a spatial discretization of Lambda-Omega partial differential equations, the study of which motivates this project. Section 3 provides an overview of the results on the finite lattice and in Section 4 we use these results to extend to a rotating wave solution on the infinite lattice. Section 5 gives a brief overview of some relevant graph-theoretic notation and results which will be used to discuss the stability of the solution over some infinite-dimensional Banach spaces in Section 6.

2 Reduction to the Model

Let us consider the lattice dynamical system coupled via discrete diffusion given by

$$\dot{z}_{i,j} = \alpha \sum_{i',j'} (z_{i',j'} - z_{i,j}) + (1 + \mathrm{i}\omega) z_{i,j} - z_{i,j}|z_{i,j}|^2, \qquad (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2 \tag{2.1}$$

where the sum is again taken over all nearest-neighbours of the lattice point (i,j), $\mathrm{i} = \sqrt{-1}$ is the imaginary constant and $z_{i,j} : \mathbb{R}^+ \to \mathbb{C}$. Here $\alpha > 0$ is interpreted as the coupling strength between neighbouring elements and ω is a non-zero real-valued constant. We make the following hypothesis on system (2.1): In the absence of coupling ($\alpha = 0$) each element of (2.1) is at the unique stable limit cycle of the system

$$\dot{z}_{i,j} = (1 + \mathrm{i}\omega) z_{i,j} - z_{i,j}|z_{i,j}|^2. \tag{2.2}$$

That is, for each index $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ the element $z_{i,j}(t)$ is oscillating with frequency $2\pi/\omega$ and amplitude $|z_{i,j}| = 1$.

Then to properly analyze system (2.1) we will write

$$z_{i,j} = r_{i,j} e^{\mathrm{i}(\Omega t + \theta_{i,j})}, \tag{2.3}$$

for each (i,j), where $r_{i,j} = r_{i,j}(t)$ and $\theta_{i,j} = \theta_{i,j}(t)$. System (2.1) can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{r}_{i,j} &= \alpha \sum_{i',j'} (r_{i',j'} \cos(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}) - r_{i,j}) + r_{i,j}(1 - r_{i,j}^2), \\ \dot{\theta}_{i,j} &= \alpha \sum_{i',j'} \frac{r_{i',j'}}{r_{i,j}} \sin(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}) + (\omega - \Omega), \quad (i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

Without loss of generality we may assume that $\Omega = \omega$, thus cancelling the final term in each equation for $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}$.

Searching for non-trivial steady-state solutions of the polar variables reduces to solving

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \alpha \sum_{i',j'} (r_{i',j'} \cos(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}) - r_{i,j}) + r_{i,j}(1 - r_{i,j}^2), \\ 0 &= \sum_{i',j'} \frac{r_{i',j'}}{r_{i,j}} \sin(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

for each $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. Then from our hypothesis, letting $\alpha \to 0^+$ gives that $r_{i,j} \to 1$ for all (i,j). This then reduces our problem to solving

$$0 = \sum_{i',j'} \sin(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}), \tag{2.6}$$

for each (i,j), which correspond to the phase-lags of system (1.1).

In the interest of generality we will simultaneously explore other coupling functions which retain some of the defining characteristics of the sine function. This therefore leads us to consider coupling functions $H : S^1 \to S^1$ such that

- $H \in C^\infty(S^1)$,
- $H(x + 2\pi) = H(x)$ for all $x \in S^1$,
- $H(-x) = -H(x)$ for all $x \in S^1$,
- $H'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$.

One should note that the final two conditions can be combined to see that we necessarily have $H(0) = 0$ and

$$H(x) > 0, \qquad x \in (0, \frac{\pi}{2}]. \tag{2.7}$$

We will see in the coming sections how this set of conditions is minimal in that each is necessary for the results obtained in this work.

Finally, the lattice structure and nearest-neighbour connections give systems (1.1) and (2.1) a natural underlying graph theoretic geometry which we exploit throughout this work. We recall that nearest-neighbours are one step along the lattice from each other and then extend this notion inductively so that we say an element is k steps away from another element if the shortest path along the lattice via nearest-neighbour connections requires us to move through exactly k lattice points. For example, the cells with indices $(1,0)$ and $(2,2)$ are said to be 3 steps away from each other with an example of a shortest path between these indices via nearest-neighbour connections given by $(1,0) \to (2,0) \to (2,1) \to (2,2)$. Aside from this geometric perspective, this can be quantified analytically by saying that two elements indexed by the lattice points (i_1, j_1) and (i_2, j_2) are k steps away from each other if

$$|i_1 - i_2| + |j_1 - j_2| = k. \tag{2.8}$$

This notion of distance along the lattice structure has important implications for our system. We see that the first derivative of any oscillator depends on the value of all nearest-neighbours as well as itself. It follows that the second derivative of any oscillator will depend on the derivative of each of its nearest-neighbours and the derivative of itself, implying that by the form of our LDS, we have the second derivative of any oscillator depending on the values of all oscillators two steps or less from it. More generally, the kth derivative of any oscillator depends on the value of all oscillators k steps or less from it. This interconnectivity between oscillators will become crucial throughout this work and provide the basis for much of the work carried out.

3 Rotating Waves on Finite Lattices

It was shown by Ermentrout and Paullet in [24] that there exists phase-locked rotating wave solutions in finite square lattices. Here we will review this work and demonstrate how it can be extended to give solutions on the infinite lattice. We begin by fixing an integer $N \geq 2$ and consider the truncated phase equations

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j} = \omega + \sum_{i',j'} H(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}), \tag{3.1}$$

where $1 - N \leq i, j \leq N$, $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ and the sum is over the nearest-neighbours of the cell (i, j) on the finite square integer lattice with side lengths $2N$. Note that not all cells have four neighbours in this case because of the truncation to a finite lattice. That is, those cells along the edges have at most three nearest-neighbours included in the sum, and if they are a corner then there will be only two nearest-neighbours in the sum.

We will follow the arguments laid out in [24] to show that there exists a phase-locked solution to (3.1) of the form $\theta_{i,j}(t) = \omega t + \bar{\theta}_{i,j}$. Such solutions all have the same frequency and a fixed phase lag $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$. We can further assume that $\omega = 0$ with no loss of generality by applying the transformation $\theta_{i,j} \to \theta_{i,j} + \omega t$ to eliminate ω in (3.1) which now reduces the search to steady-states corresponding to the phase lags. A rotating wave solution in this framework is defined such that for any ring about the centre of the $2N \times 2N$ array, the values of the phase lags increase from zero up to 2π. Hence, we seek a steady-state solution with the symmetry shown in Figure 1. In this way, we may reduce the number of equations from $4N^2$ to $\frac{1}{2}N(N-1)$ by focusing on those whose indices lie in the range $1 \leq j < i \leq N$, which we refer to as the reduced system. The reduced system is represented by the shaded cells in Figure 1.

Upon applying these reductions to the system we arrive at the problem of finding a steady-state to the system of equations given by

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j} = \sum_{i',j'} H(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}), \qquad 1 \leq j < i \leq N. \tag{3.2}$$



Figure 1: Symmetry of the phase-locked solution on the finite lattice. The shaded cells represent the reduced system.

with initial conditions $\theta_{i,j}(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$. We also impose the boundary conditions $\theta_{i,i} = 0$ and $\theta_{i,0} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{i,1}$ for $1 \leq i \leq N$ which are reflected in Figure 1 for reference. These boundary conditions lead to certain properties which are used to show the existence of a steady-state solution. In particular, the cells directly below the diagonal ($j = i - 1$) are connected to two diagonal elements (above and to the left) which reduces their differential equations to

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_{i,i-1} &= H(0 - \theta_{i,i-1}) + H(0 - \theta_{i,i-1}) + \cdots \\ &= -2H(\theta_{i,i-1}) + \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

Here we have used the odd symmetry of the coupling function and those terms indicated in the ellipsis are the coupling terms to the right and below. Also, the cells in the first row of the reduced system ($j = 1$) have a special term due to their connection with the boundary terms at $j = 0$ given by

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\theta}_{i,1} &= H\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{i,1} - \theta_{i,1}\right) + \cdots \\ &= H\left(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\theta_{i,1}\right) + \cdots . \end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

Remark. One will notice that there is a slight difference in the initial conditions between the work in [24] and of that which is given here. In the former, the initial

conditions are taken to be $\theta_{i,j}(0) = 0$, whereas here we will note that they are $\theta_{i,j}(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$. This does not lead to any significantly different analysis, but as we'll see will be useful in extending these results to the infinite lattice.

The proof that a rotating wave solution exists on the finite lattice is broken down into two lemmas which together show that the trajectories are decreasing and bounded below for all $t > 0$. These lemmas together show that the trajectories therefore tend to an equilibrium as $t \to \infty$. The proof will only be briefly summarized here as it is nearly the same as that given by Ermentrout and Paullet, with the only distinction being that of a sign change. Furthermore, an understanding of the methods employed in the proof on the finite lattice leads to a greater understanding of those used to extend to the infinite lattice.

Lemma 3.1. *Given $\theta_{i,j}(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$, there exists a $t_0 > 0$ such that $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) < 0$ for all $0 < t < t_0$ and $1 \leq j < i \leq N$.*

Proof. Let us observe that with the initial conditions $\theta_{i,j}(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(0) = \sum_{i',j'} H(0) = 0, \tag{3.5}$$

for all $j \neq i - 1$ because $H(0) = 0$ by the odd symmetry of H. In the case when $j = i - 1$, from (3.3) we get

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(0) = -2H\left(\frac{\pi}{4}\right) + 2H(0) < 0. \tag{3.6}$$

This implies that there is an interval of t values to the right of zero in which the value $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ indexed by an element directly below the diagonal of the reduced system is decreasing.

An inductive argument will show that when $j \neq i - 1$ we have

$$\left.\frac{d^k \theta_{i,j}}{dt^k}\right|_{t=0} = 0, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, i - j - 1 \tag{3.7}$$

and

$$\left.\frac{d^{(i-j)} \theta_{i,j}}{dt^{(i-j)}}\right|_{t=0} < 0. \tag{3.8}$$

That is, the number of steps an element of the reduced system is from the diagonal determines which order derivative will be nonzero first. Then conditions (3.7) and (3.8) together imply that upon expanding each $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ as a Taylor series about $t = 0$ we get

$$\theta_{i,j}(t) = \frac{\pi}{4} + \frac{a_{i,j}}{(i-j)!} t^{i-j} + \mathcal{O}(|t|^{i-j+1}), \tag{3.9}$$

where $a_{i,j} < 0$ is used to denote the term (3.8) for each (i,j). Differentiating (3.9) with respect to t provides the Taylor series for $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t)$ about $t = 0$, given by

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) = \frac{a_{i,j}}{(i-j-1)!} t^{i-j-1} + \mathcal{O}(|t|^{i-j}). \tag{3.10}$$

Since $a_{i,j} < 0$, we have that $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) < 0$ for sufficiently small $t > 0$ for each $1 \leq j < i \leq N$. But then since there are only finitely many elements in the reduced system, it follows that there exists a $t_0 > 0$ small enough so that $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) < 0$ for all $0 < t < t_0$ and $1 \leq j < i \leq N$, giving the desired result. □

Lemma 3.2. *For all $t > 0$ and $1 \leq j < i \leq N$ we have $0 < \theta_{i,j}(t) < \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) < 0$.*

Proof. Assume the contrary. That is, let $\hat{t} > 0$ be the first place where either $\theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ or $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ for some index $(\hat{i},\hat{j})$. We will break this proof up into two case: (1) to show that there cannot be an index which satisfies $\theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ and (2) that there cannot be an index such that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ for all $t > 0$ and finite.

Case 1: Working with the first case we assume that $\theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ for some $(\hat{i},\hat{j})$. Then we note that from the minimality of $\hat{t}$ we necessarily have $0 \leq \theta_{i,j}(\hat{t}) < \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) \leq 0$ for all i,j. Using the special form (3.4) of those elements with $j = 1$ we see that $\hat{j} \neq 1$ since

$$\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},1}(\hat{t}) = H\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) + H(\theta_{\hat{i},2}(\hat{t})) + H(\theta_{\hat{i}-1,1}(\hat{t})) + \begin{cases} H(\theta_{\hat{i}+1,1}(\hat{t})) & : \hat{i} \neq N \\ 0 & : \hat{i} = N \end{cases}, \tag{3.11}$$

which following (2.7) gives that each term in the sum is nonnegative, with $H(\frac{\pi}{2}) > 0$, thus giving that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},1}(\hat{t}) > 0$, contradicting our assumption.

Moving to a pair $(\hat{i},\hat{j})$ with $\hat{j} \neq 1$ we see that if $\theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ we get

$$\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = \sum_{i',j'} H(\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t})). \tag{3.12}$$

Since all elements of the reduced system are nonnegative at $t = \hat{t}$ we have that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) \geq 0$, again from (2.7). But from the definition of $\hat{t}$ we know that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) \leq 0$, implying that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$. The only way in which this is possible is if elements indexed by nearest-neighbours of $(\hat{i},\hat{j})$ are such that $\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) = 0$ as well. This allows us to move to the nearest-neighbour indexed by $(\hat{i},\hat{j}-1)$ and perform the same analysis to similarly find that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}-1}(\hat{t}) \geq 0$. Again, the only way in which this is possible is if all elements indexed by nearest-neighbours of $(\hat{i},\hat{j}-1)$ take the value 0 at $t = \hat{t}$. This process

continues by systematically moving down one cell at a time through the lattice until we find that $\theta_{\hat{i},2}(\hat{t}) = 0$. But then

$$\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},2}(\hat{t}) = H(\theta_{\hat{i},1}(\hat{t})) + \cdots , \tag{3.13}$$

where the neglected terms in the ellipsis are those elements to the left, above and to the right (if $\hat{i} \neq N$). As before, the neglected terms return a nonnegative value but one notices that since we have already shown that $\theta_{\hat{i},1}(\hat{t}) > 0$, it follows from (2.7) that $H(\theta_{\hat{i},1}(\hat{t})) > 0$. This then gives that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},2}(\hat{t}) > 0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, no $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ can reach 0 at $t = \hat{t}$.

Case 2: Turning to the second case, we suppose $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$. Clearly we cannot have $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) = 0$ for all i, j since this would mean that we have reached an equilibrium point in finite t, which is impossible. Therefore, it can be assumed that there exists some index (i_0, j_0) such that $\dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(\hat{t}) < 0$ and again $0 \leq \theta_{i,j}(\hat{t}) < \frac{\pi}{4}$ and $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) \leq 0$ for all i, j.

Let θ_{i_0,j_0} be the closest indexed element to $\theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}$ with $\dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(\hat{t}) < 0$. Without loss of generality, we may assume that $(\hat{i}, \hat{j})$ and (i_0, j_0) are nearest-neighbours. Indeed, as previously noted, at $t = \hat{t}$ not all elements of the reduced system can have a derivative that vanishes, therefore there must be a pair of nearest-neighbours such that one of their derivatives vanishes at $t = \hat{t}$ and the other does not. If we can show that this cannot be possible, then necessarily we have that every element of the reduced system $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ is such that either $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) < 0$ or $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) = 0$. Since the later is impossible, we must have the former, completing the proof.

Now, we proceed under the assumption that $(\hat{i}, \hat{j})$ and (i_0, j_0) are nearest-neighbours. The assumption $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = 0$ implies that

$$\ddot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = \sum_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'} H'(\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) - \theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}))\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}), \tag{3.14}$$

where H' denotes the derivative of H with respect to its argument. By assumption, at $t = \hat{t}$ we have $0 \leq \theta_{i,j}(\hat{t}) < \frac{\pi}{4}$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N$, so that

$$|\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) - \theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t})| < \frac{\pi}{4}. \tag{3.15}$$

Since H is assumed to be strictly increasing on $(\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, it follows that

$$H'(\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) - \theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t})) > 0. \tag{3.16}$$

Furthermore, every element of the reduced system satisfies $\dot{\theta}_{i,j}(\hat{t}) \leq 0$, with the additional assumption that $\dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(\hat{t}) < 0$ giving

$$\ddot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) = \sum_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'} H'(\theta_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) - \theta_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}))\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i}',\hat{j}'}(\hat{t}) < 0, \tag{3.17}$$

since (i_0, j_0) and $(\hat{i}, \hat{j})$ are nearest-neighbours.

Now, expanding $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t)$ as a Taylor series about $t = \hat{t}$ gives

$$\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t) = \ddot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t})(t - \hat{t}) + \mathcal{O}(|t - \hat{t}|^2), \tag{3.18}$$

since $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t) = 0$. Since $\ddot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(\hat{t}) < 0$, we have that there exists a sufficiently small nontrivial interval of t values to the left of $\hat{t}$ such that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t) > 0$. But this implies that there exists a positive $t' < \hat{t}$ such that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t') = 0$ since Lemma 3.1 gave that $\dot{\theta}_{\hat{i},\hat{j}}(t) < 0$ for sufficiently small $t > 0$. This therefore contradicts the minimality of $\hat{t}$ and hence from our arguments above, no derivative of the $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ can vanish at a finite value of t, completing the proof. □

In summary, it was shown that each element of the reduced system is such that

$$0 < \theta_{i,j}(t) < \frac{\pi}{4} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \dot{\theta}_{i,j}(t) < 0 \tag{3.19}$$

for all $t > 0$ and $1 \leq j < i \leq N$. Hence, $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ is a decreasing function which is bounded below, so

$$\bar{\theta}_{i,j} = \lim_{t \to \infty} \theta_{i,j}(t) \tag{3.20}$$

exists and lies in the interval $[0, \frac{\pi}{4})$. Therefore $\{\bar{\theta}_{i,j}\}_{1 \leq j < i \leq N}$ gives an equilibrium for the reduced system. As a brief aside, one can further show via the same methods used in Lemma 3.2 that $\bar{\theta}_{i,j} > 0$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N$.

To extend the solution of the reduced system to the entire square lattice we refer to Figure 2 where the finite $2N \times 2N$ lattice has been partitioned into eight distinct regions. To begin, it has already been remarked that those elements along the diagonal between regions I and $VIII$ are fixed at 0. Then those on the diagonal between regions II and III are fixed at $\frac{\pi}{2}$, those between regions IV and V are fixed at π and those between regions VI and VII are fixed at $\frac{3\pi}{2}$. If we write $\bar{\theta}$ to be the solution of the reduced system found above, the solutions in each of the regions of Figure 2 are as



Figure 2: The eight distinct regions of the finite lattice defined by the reduced system.

follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
I &: \bar{\theta} \to \bar{\theta} \\
II &: \bar{\theta} \to \frac{\pi}{2} - \bar{\theta} \\
III &: \bar{\theta} \to \frac{\pi}{2} + \bar{\theta} \\
IV &: \bar{\theta} \to \pi - \bar{\theta} \\
V &: \bar{\theta} \to \pi + \bar{\theta} \\
VI &: \bar{\theta} \to \frac{3\pi}{2} - \bar{\theta} \\
VII &: \bar{\theta} \to \frac{3\pi}{2} + \bar{\theta} \\
VIII &: \bar{\theta} \to -\bar{\theta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.21}$$

Note that these extensions give exactly the symmetry of the solution shown in Figure 1.

4 Rotating Waves on an Infinite Lattice

We now consider the existence of rotating waves on an infinite lattice. Consider the infinite system of phase equations

$$\dot{\theta}_{i,j} = \omega + \sum_{i',j'} H(\theta_{i',j'} - \theta_{i,j}), \tag{4.1}$$

where $(i,j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$ and as before $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$. We again seek rotating wave solutions to such a system of differential equations of the form $\theta_{i,j}(t) = \omega t + \bar{\theta}_{i,j}$, where $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ is a time-independent phase-lag. We provide the following result.

Theorem 4.1. *The system of differential equations* (4.1) *has a nontrivial phase-locked rotating wave solution.*

As before, without loss of generality we can assume $\omega = 0$ and we are therefore looking for equilibria of the phase system which correspond to the phase lags of the rotating wave solution. Throughout this section when referring to the solution on a finite lattice, we mean the one found in the previous section, and illustrated in Figure 1.

Lemma 4.2. *Let $N \geq 2$ and finite. If we denote $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ as the solutions on the finite $2N \times 2N$ lattice in the reduced system* (3.2)*, then $\bar{\theta}_{i+1,j} \geq \bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i \leq N-1$.*

Proof. This proof follows in a very similar way to how we proceeded in Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2 to show that the $\theta_{i,j}(t)$ of the reduced system are decreasing for all $t > 0$. We begin by using the conditions of the derivatives (3.7) and (3.8) to find that there exists a small interval to the right of zero for which $\theta_{i,j}(t) < \theta_{i+1,j}(t)$ for all $t > 0$ belonging to this interval. Then we assume that this interval is finite to arrive at a contradiction showing that these inequalities hold for all $t > 0$. Upon showing that these inequalities hold for all $t > 0$, we may extend them to the steady-state solution by having $t \to \infty$, giving the desired result.

Recall that we take our initial conditions to be $\theta_{i,j}(0) = \frac{\pi}{4}$ for all (i,j) in the reduced system and those on the diagonal fixed at 0. From Lemma 3.1 we have $\dot{\theta}_{i,i-1}(0) < 0$ and

$$\left.\frac{d^k \theta_{i,j}}{dt^k}\right|_{t=0} = 0, \qquad k = 1, \ldots, i-j-1 \tag{4.2}$$

with

$$\left.\frac{d^{(i-j)} \theta_{i,j}}{dt^{(i-j)}}\right|_{t=0} < 0, \tag{4.3}$$



Figure 3: The lattice points indexed by (i_0, j_0) and $(i_0 + 1, j_0)$ along with their nearest-neighbours.

for each $j \neq i - 1$. Then from these facts we have that upon expanding the difference $\theta_{i,j}(t) - \theta_{i+1,j}(t)$ as a Taylor series about $t = 0$ the first $(i - j - 1)$ terms vanish leaving

$$\theta_{i,j}(t) - \theta_{i+1,j}(t) = \frac{b_{i,j}}{(i-j)!} t^{(i-j)} + \mathcal{O}(|t|^{i-j+1}), \tag{4.4}$$

where

$$b_{i,j} = \left.\frac{d^{(i-j)}\theta_{i,j}}{dt^{(i-j)}}\right|_{t=0} - \underbrace{\left.\frac{d^{(i-j)}\theta_{i+1,j}}{dt^{(i-j)}}\right|_{t=0}}_{=0} = \left.\frac{d^{(i-j)}\theta_{i,j}}{dt^{(i-j)}}\right|_{t=0} < 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Therefore, there exists small $t > 0$ such that $\theta_{i,j}(t) - \theta_{i+1,j}(t) < 0$, thus implying that $\theta_{i,j}(t) < \theta_{i+1,j}(t)$ on this interval. Since this is true for all elements of the reduced system, which is finite, there exists a $t_0 > 0$ such that $\theta_{i,j}(t) < \theta_{i+1,j}(t)$ for all $t \in (0, t_0)$ and $1 \leq j < i \leq N - 1$.

We now assume that this ordering of the elements of the reduced system only persists for finite t. That is, let $t_0 > 0$ be the first value of t in which the inequality no longer holds for all elements of the reduced system. Then there exists at least one index of the reduced system, (i_0, j_0), such that $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)$, and $\theta_{i+1,j}(t_0) \geq \theta_{i,j}(t_0)$ for all $(i, j) \neq (i_0, j_0)$. We first note that $j_0 \neq i_0$. Indeed, by Lemma 3.2 the elements of the reduced system satisfy $0 < \theta_{i,j}(t) < \frac{\pi}{4}$ for all $t > 0$ and one sees that

$$\theta_{i_0+1,i_0}(t) > 0 = \theta_{i_0,i_0}(t). \tag{4.6}$$

Hence, along every row of the reduced system, there must be at least one strict inequality at $t = t_0$. Therefore, without loss of generality, we may assume that the index (i_0, j_0) is such that $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0) > \theta_{i_0-1,j_0}(t_0)$.

Now let us investigate $\dot{\theta}_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)$. Using the form of the differential

equations given in (4.1) we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\dot{\theta}_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(t_0) &= H(\theta_{i_0+1,j_0+1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) - H(\theta_{i_0,j_0+1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) \\ &+ H(\theta_{i_0+1,j_0-1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) - H(\theta_{i_0,j_0-1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) \\ &+ \begin{cases} H(\theta_{i_0+2,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) - H(\theta_{i_0-1,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) & : i_0 \neq N-1 \\ -H(\theta_{i_0-1,j_0+1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) & : i_0 = N-1 \end{cases}\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

where $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0)$ has been replaced with $\theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)$ by our assumption. Furthermore, notice that the coupling between these cells does not appear in the difference since

$$H(\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) = H(0) = 0, \tag{4.8}$$

because $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)$. Figure 3 shows the location of these elements in relation to each other on the lattice for visual reference. Since $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0) > \theta_{i_0-1,j_0}(t_0)$ we see that upon using the odd symmetry of H we have

$$-H(\theta_{i_0-1,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) = H(\theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0-1,j_0}(t_0)) > 0. \tag{4.9}$$

Moreover, in the case when $i_0 \neq N-1$ our assumption gives $\theta_{i_0+2,j_0}(t_0) \geq \theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)$ which implies

$$H(\theta_{i_0+2,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) \geq 0. \tag{4.10}$$

Again by the minimality of t_0 we get that $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0\pm1}(t_0) \geq \theta_{i_0,j_0\pm1}$, leading to the fact that

$$H(\theta_{i_0+1,j_0\pm1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) - H(\theta_{i_0,j_0\pm1}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)) \geq 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Putting this all together reveals that

$$\dot{\theta}_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(t_0) > 0. \tag{4.12}$$

Expanding $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t)$ as a Taylor series about $t = t_0$ gives

$$\begin{aligned}&\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t) = \\ &\underbrace{[\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)]}_{=0} + \underbrace{[\dot{\theta}_{i_0+1,j_0}(t_0) - \dot{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}(t_0)]}_{>0}(t-t_0) + \mathcal{O}(|t-t_0|^2).\end{aligned} \tag{4.13}$$

Thus, there exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t) < 0$ on $(t_0 - \varepsilon, t_0)$. But it was already shown that for $t > 0$ sufficiently small we have $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t) - \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t) > 0$, which from the Intermediate Value Theorem implies that there is some positive $t' < t_0$ such that $\theta_{i_0+1,j_0}(t') = \theta_{i_0,j_0}(t')$. This contradicts the minimality of t_0, thus giving that no such t_0 can exist.

Therefore, $\theta_{i+1,j}(t) > \theta_{i,j}(t)$ for all $t > 0$. Allowing $t \to \infty$ we see that the elements of the equilibrium must satisfy $\bar{\theta}_{i+1,j} \geq \bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ for all $1 \leq j \leq i \leq N-1$, giving the desired result. □

Lemma 4.3. *Let us denote $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N)}$ as the solutions of the finite $2N \times 2N$ lattice in the reduced system for any $N \geq 2$. Then $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N)} \leq \bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N+1)}$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N$. That is, the value of the equilibrium point at each index in the reduced system is increasing as a function of the size of the lattice.*

Proof. Let us fix $N \geq 2$ and assume there exists an index (i_0, j_0) of the reduced system (3.2) such that $\bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}^{(N)} > \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}^{(N+1)}$. This proof is carried out by examining the case when (i_0, j_0) is an index from the last column (i.e. $i_0 = N$), deriving a contradiction and systematically decreasing the possible value of i_0 one step at a time to show that no such (i_0, j_0) can exist. We show that the contradiction which is derived for the last column ($i_0 = N$) is easily extended to derive a contradiction in the cases that $i_0 < N$. This in turn exhausts all possibilities of indices (i_0, j_0) in a finite number of steps, thus showing that $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N)} \leq \bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N+1)}$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N$.

Case $i_0 = N$: We begin by assuming that $i_0 = N$. Consider the difference of the differential equations $\dot{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \dot{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}$ evaluated at the respective equilibrium points for that size of lattice. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \\ &+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \\ &+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \\ &+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N+1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.14}$$

where there is an odd number of terms since the $2N \times 2N$ lattice does not have a right input at the index (N, j_0). From Lemma 4.2 we have that $\bar{\theta}_{N+1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)} \geq 0$, which from (2.7) implies that

$$H(\bar{\theta}_{N+1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) \geq 0. \tag{4.15}$$

Then using (4.15) we may rearrange (4.14) to find that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq\ & H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \\ &+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \\ &+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.16}$$

This in turn implies that at least one of the following must be true:

- $H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0+1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \leq 0,$
- $H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0-1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \leq 0,$
- $H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)}) \leq 0.$

By definition of our coupling function H, we have that $H'(x) > 0$ for all $x \in (\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$, and recalling from Lemma 3.2 that the maximal difference between any two elements of the reduced system is strictly bounded by $\pi/2$, we find that the above conditions reduce to having at least one of the following being true

- $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0+1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0} \leq \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0+1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0} \implies \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0+1} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0+1}$,
- $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0-1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0} \leq \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0-1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0} \implies \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0-1} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0-1}$,
- $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0} \leq \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,j_0} \implies \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0}$.

Here these conditions have been reduced by recalling that by assumption $\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i_0,j_0} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i_0,j_0}$. For simplicity we relabel the index (N, j_0) as η_1 and let η_2 to be the nearest-neighbour of η_1 with the property that $\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2}$.

We note that there are restrictions on the choice of η_2 in certain cases. That is, if $j_0 = 1$ then by the form of the solutions on the finite lattice we necessarily have

$$\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i_0,0} = \frac{\pi}{2} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i_0,1} > \frac{\pi}{2} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i_0,1} = \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i_0,0}, \tag{4.17}$$

meaning that η_2 cannot be below η_1 when $j_0 = 1$. Furthermore, if $j_0 = i_0 - 1$ then $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i_0,i_0} = 0 = \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i_0,i_0}$ showing that η_2 cannot be above or to the left of η_1 when $j_0 = i_0 - 1$. Since $N \geq 2$ we can always find an index η_2 with the prescribed properties in either situation.

We now apply a similar argument to the difference of the differential equations

$$(\dot{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1} + \dot{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2}) - (\dot{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1} + \dot{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2}) \tag{4.18}$$

evaluated at the respective equilibrium for that size of lattice. This gives

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = &\sum_{\eta_1'} \left[H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1}) \right] \\ &+ \sum_{\eta_2'} \left[H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2}) \right], \end{aligned} \tag{4.19}$$

where we have paired the elements by their index. This expression can be simplified slightly by recalling that η_1 and η_2 are nearest-neighbours in the lattice. Therefore, the terms

$$H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2}) \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1}) \tag{4.21}$$

both appear in this sum. Thus, using the odd symmetry of the coupling function, these terms eliminate themselves from the sum. Similarly, the terms $-H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2})$ and $-H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1})$ cancel each other in the sum by the odd symmetry of the coupling function H.

Then (4.19) again has the term $H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N+1,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0})$ being nonnegative, coming from the index η_1 again. Rearranging (4.19) as above then shows that at least one of

$$H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_1}) \leq 0 \tag{4.22}$$

or

$$H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_2}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2'} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_2}) \leq 0 \tag{4.23}$$

must hold for a nearest-neighbour of either η_1 or η_2. Let us denote η_3 to be this index. Notice that $\eta_3 \neq \eta_1, \eta_2$ since the coupling terms between these neighbouring cells has been eliminated by the odd symmetry of the coupling function. Now for $i = 1$ or 2 we have that

$$H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_3} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_i}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_3} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_i}) \leq 0, \tag{4.24}$$

then from the argument laid out for η_2 above, we have that

$$\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_3} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_i} \leq \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_3} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_i} \implies \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_3} < \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_3}, \tag{4.25}$$

simply by recalling that $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_i} < \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_i}$ by definition of η_1 and η_2. Finally, the choice of η_3 is restricted to those indices (i, j) of the reduced system such that neither $j = 0$ nor $i = j$, by the previous discussion for the possibilities for η_2.

We continue this process inductively by considering the differential equations

$$\sum_{k=1}^{m} \dot{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_k} - \sum_{k=1}^{m} \dot{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_k} \tag{4.26}$$

evaluated at the respective equilibrium points, for any $m \geq 1$. Since the differential equation of the element indexed by η_1 is always considered in this sum we will always have a nonnegative term in $H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N+1,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0})$, allowing us to determine that there is a nearest-neighbour, η_{m+1}, of one of the η_k such that $\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{\eta_{m+1}} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{\eta_{m+1}}$, via the same process outlined for $m = 1, 2$. As before, the sum will eliminate any coupling present between neighbouring indices, meaning that at each step the cardinality of the set of indices $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^{m}$ increases by one, and it can never be the case that $\eta_{m+1} = (i, j)$ is such that $j = 0$ or $i = j$. In this way we are restricted in our choices to those which are contained within the reduced system. This process is illustrated in Figure 4 for visual reference.

We have already noted that the choices of the η_k are restricted to those in the reduced system, which is finite. Therefore, this process eventually terminates showing



Figure 4: The reduced system with $N = 8$ and a possible collection of the indices $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^{9}$ with the elligible choices for η_{10} shaded in. The black cells represent the boundaries of the reduced system which cannot be included in the sequence $\{\eta_k\}_{k=1}^{N(N+2)/2}$.

that for every element of the reduced system we have $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N)} > \bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N+1)}$. At this final step we then consider

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N(N-1)/2} \dot{\theta}_{\eta_k}^{(N+1)} - \sum_{k=1}^{N(N-1)/2} \dot{\theta}_{\eta_k}^{(N)} \tag{4.27}$$

evaluated at the respective equilibria of that lattice size to see that only the interactions with the boundaries of the reduced system remain. That is, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& (H(\bar{\theta}_{2,1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{2,1}^{(N+1)})) + 2\sum_{k=2}^{N-1}\left(H(\bar{\theta}_{k,k-1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{k,k-1}^{(N+1)})\right) \\ &+ (H(\bar{\theta}_{N,N-1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,N-1}^{(N+1)})) + \sum_{k=1}^{N}\left(H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}_{k,1}^{(N+1)}) - H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}_{k,1}^{(N)})\right) \\ &+ \sum_{k=1}^{N} H(\bar{\theta}_{N+1,k}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,k}^{(N+1)}), \end{aligned} \tag{4.28}$$

where the first three groups of terms come from the coupling with the diagonal (i, i) terms, the fourth grouping coming from the coupling with the $j = 0$ row and the final grouping of terms is from the coupling to the right of the Nth column. We have

used the special forms (3.3) and (3.4) of the boundary interactions to obtain these reductions. Now from our inductive proceedure we have shown that $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N)} > \bar{\theta}_{i,j}^{(N+1)}$ for every element of the reduced system, and from the fact that H is increasing on $(\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(\bar{\theta}_{2,1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{2,1}^{(N+1)}) > 0, \\
&\sum_{k=2}^{N-1} \left(H(\bar{\theta}_{k,k-1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{k,k-1}^{(N+1)}) \right) > 0, \\
&H(\bar{\theta}_{N,N-1}^{(N)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,N-1}^{(N+1)}) > 0, \\
&\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}_{k,1}^{(N+1)}) - H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}_{k,1}^{(N)}) \right) > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Furthermore,

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N} H(\bar{\theta}_{N+1,k}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,k}^{(N+1)}) \geq 0 \tag{4.30}$$

from our results in Lemma 4.2, showing that the right hand side of (4.28) is strictly positive, which is impossible. Therefore, $i_0 \neq N$.

Case $i_0 = N-1$: Now that we have proven $i_0 \neq N$, we will move one column to the left and consider the case when $i_0 = N-1$. We begin by noting that if $\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} > \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)}$ then necessarily

$$H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)}) \geq 0. \tag{4.31}$$

Indeed, if we assume that this is not true then it is the case that

$$\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)} < \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} \implies \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)} > \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}, \tag{4.32}$$

which we have already shown to be impossible. With this in mind we can proceed as above by considering the differential equations

$$\dot{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \dot{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)} \tag{4.33}$$

at their respective equilibria. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = &H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0+1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0+1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)}) \\
&+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0-1}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0-1}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)}) \\
&+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N-2,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N-2,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)}) \\
&+ H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N+1)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N+1)}) - H(\bar{\theta}_{N,j_0}^{(N)} - \bar{\theta}_{N-1,j_0}^{(N)}).
\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

One will notice a slight difference to the case when $i_0 = N$ in that now we have an even number of terms in the equation, but from (4.31) we may rearrange (4.34) to be handled in a similar way to the case when $i_0 = N$ by

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \geq\ & H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0+1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0+1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0}) \\ & + H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0-1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,j_0}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0-1} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0}) \\ & + H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-2,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,j_0}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-2,j_0} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,j_0}). \end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

Thus the term (4.31) acts as the single nonnegative term in the difference when $i_0 = N$. Proceeding as above we can find a nearest-neighbour of $(N-1, j_0)$ to which the element at that index for the $2N \times 2N$ lattice is greater than the element at that index for the $2(N+1) \times 2(N+1)$ lattice. This leads to the same chain of steps as in the case when $i_0 = N$, where we now find that the indices which give the desired conditions are limited to not only those in the reduced system, but to those not in the Nth column.

Again this procedure terminates in a finite number of steps, showing that $\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i,j} < \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i,j}$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N-1$. Then as above, the differential equations

$$\sum_{1 \leq j < i \leq N-1} \dot{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i,j} - \sum_{1 \leq j < i \leq N-1} \dot{\theta}^{(N)}_{i,j} \tag{4.36}$$

evaluated at their respective equilibria leads to a cancelling of all interior coupling terms, thus leaving only connections with the boundary:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 =& (H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{2,1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{2,1})) + 2\sum_{k=2}^{N-2} \left(H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{k,k-1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{k,k-1}) \right) \\ & + (H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,N-2}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,N-2})) + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{k,1}) - H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{k,1}) \right) \\ & + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \left(H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,k} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,k}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,k} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,k}) \right). \end{aligned} \tag{4.37}$$

In exactly the same way as the case $i_0 = N$ we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
&H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{2,1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{2,1}) > 0,\\
&\sum_{k=2}^{N-2}\left(H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{k,k-1}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{k,k-1})\right) > 0,\\
&H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,N-2}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,N-2}) > 0,\\
&\sum_{k=1}^{N-1}\left(H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{k,1}) - H(\frac{\pi}{2} - 2\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{k,1})\right) > 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.38}$$

Furthermore, following (4.31) one has that

$$\sum_{k=1}^{N-1}\left(H(\bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N,k} - \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{N-1,k}) - H(\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N,k} - \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{N-1,k})\right) \geq 0, \tag{4.39}$$

therefore, upon putting this all together, the right hand side of (4.37) is strictly positive. This gives a contradiction, thus showing that $i_0 \neq N-1$.

Cases $i_0 < N-1$: We may continue with this method by showing that if $i_0 \neq N-k$, for some $1 \leq k < N$, then $i_0 \neq N-k-1$ by merely applying the same arguments which were used in proving that $i_0 \neq N-1$ from the result that $i_0 \neq N$. This leads to a process of systematically decreasing i_0 by one each step and repeating a similar argument used in the cases $i_0 = N, N-1$ to see that there is no such column in the reduced system which can contain an element that satisfies $\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i,j} > \bar{\theta}^{(N+1)}_{i,j}$. This then completes the proof of the lemma since there is only a finite number of columns to check. □

This leads to the proof of Theorem 4.1.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Lemma 4.3 shows that by observing the value of the equilibrium solution for each lattice size at a single index in the reduced system we form an increasing sequence. By taking any $N \geq 2$ we can identify the equilibrium solution inside the reduced system of the $2N \times 2N$ lattice as an element of the reduced system in the infinite lattice by appending the elements

$$\bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i,j} = 0 \tag{4.40}$$

for all $i > N$ and $1 \leq j < i$. We have now created a sequence of elements in the reduced system of the infinite lattice which is pointwise increasing and each element is bounded above by $\pi/4$, therefore this sequence converges pointwise as $N \to \infty$.

Let us write

$$\bar{\theta}_{i,j} := \lim_{N\to\infty} \bar{\theta}^{(N)}_{i,j}, \qquad 1 \leq j < i. \tag{4.41}$$

By the continuity of the differential equations at each index of the reduced system we see that these elements are themselves an equilibrium of the reduced system of the infinite lattice and that $\bar{\theta}_{i,j} \in (0, \frac{\pi}{4}]$ for all $1 \leq j < i$. Moreover, we can apply the symmetries of the finite lattices shown in Figure 2 to extend this equilibrium in the reduced system to an equilibrium of the entire two-dimensional lattice via the same extensions outlined by Ermentrout and Paullet in (3.21). Then writing this equilibrium extended to the entire infinite lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$ as $\bar{\theta} = \{\bar{\theta}_{i,j}\}_{i,j}$, the phase locked solution to the phase equation (4.1) is given by

$$\theta_{i,j}(t) = \omega t + \bar{\theta}_{i,j} \tag{4.42}$$

for all $(i, j) \in \mathbb{Z}^2$. □

Remark. It was noted previously that a rotating wave solution on the lattice is such that the phase-lags over any concentric ring about the centre four cell ring increase from 0 up to 2π. Although not explicitly stated in our result, this is indeed the case. Furthermore, such a result was implied in Ermentrout and Paullet's work on the finite lattice, although it is notably absent from their work. We state the following lemma without proof.

Lemma 4.4. *Let $N \geq 2$ and finite. If we denote $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ as the solutions on the finite $2N \times 2N$ lattice in the reduced system, then $\bar{\theta}_{i,j} \geq \bar{\theta}_{i,j+1}$ for all $1 \leq j < i \leq N$.*

The proof of Lemma 4.4 is carried out in an almost identical process to that of Lemma 4.2 and is therefore omitted from this work. Letting $N \to \infty$ we see that the inequalities along both the rows and columns given by Lemmas 4.2 and 4.4, respectively, remain true and once the extensions from the reduced system to the whole lattice are applied we obtain a true rotating wave solution.

Having now shown the existence of phase-locked rotating wave solutions to system (4.1) we turn our attention to determining its stability. It was shown that each solution on the finite lattices is asymptotically stable and we wish to extend this result to the case of the infinite lattice. Before doing so we require some basic notions from graph theory to properly frame the problem.

5 Graph Theoretic Framework

We consider a graph $G = (V, E)$ with an at most countable collection of vertices, V, and a set of edges between these vertices, E, with the property that at most one edge can connect two vertices and no edge can originate and terminate on the same vertex. If there exists an edge $e \in E$ connecting the two vertices $x, y \in V$ then we write $x \sim y$, and because all edges are taken as undirected this relation is symmetric, i.e. $y \sim x$ as

well. A graph is called connected if for any two vertices $x, y \in V$ there exists a finite sequence of vertices in V, $\{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n\}$, such that $x \sim x_1$, $x_1 \sim x_2$, $\ldots$, $x_n \sim y$.

We consider the notion of an operator on the graph by considering a potential function $P : V \to \mathbb{R}$ along with a weight function $w : V \times V \to [0, \infty)$ with the property that $w(x, y) = w(y, x)$ and $w(x, y) > 0$ if and only if $x \sim y$. Then for any function $f : V \to \mathbb{C}$ acting on the vertices of G we define the *discrete elliptic (linear) operator* L acting on these functions by

$$Lf(x) = P(x)f(x) + \sum_{x \sim y} w(x, y)(f(x) - f(y)). \tag{5.1}$$

We will often write $L = P + A$, where A denotes the sum in the formula above. The operator A is typically referred to as a *graph Laplacian* and one should notice that A maps constant functions to 0. Moreover, since G is a connected graph, $Af = 0$ if and only if f is a constant function.

Each discrete elliptic operator naturally defines a quadratic form by

$$Q(f) := \sum_{x \in V} Lf(x) \cdot \overline{f(x)} = P(x)|f(x)|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in V} \sum_{x \sim y} w(x, y)|f(x) - f(y)|^2. \tag{5.2}$$

To justify this notice that $w(x, y)$ contributes to the sum twice by the symmetry of the weight function. Then this gives

$$\begin{aligned} w(x, y)(f(x) - f(y))\overline{f(x)} + w(y, x)(f(y) - f(x))\overline{f(y)} &= w(x, y)(f(x) - f(y))\overline{(f(x) - f(y))} \\ &= w(x, y)|f(x) - f(y)|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{5.3}$$

Furthermore, the factor of one half in front of the sum comes from the fact that everything is being summed twice, again by the symmetry of the weight function.

Since V is at most countable, we turn our interest to the alternate form of the sequence spaces $\ell^p(V)$ given by

$$\ell^p(V) = \{f : V \to \mathbb{C} \mid \sum_{x \in V} |f(x)|^p < \infty\}, \tag{5.4}$$

for any $p \in [1, \infty)$ and $\ell^\infty(V)$ the space of all bounded functions on V. One often writes the elements of the sequence spaces in the alternative form $f = \{f_x\}_{x \in V}$, where $f_x := f(x)$. Our primary interest lies in the case when $p = 2$, the Hilbert Space $\ell^2(V)$ equipped with the natural inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \sum_{x \in V} f(x) \cdot \overline{g(x)}. \tag{5.5}$$

Using the symmetry of the weight function one can see that L is a symmetric operator and in the cases it is everywhere defined, it is self-adjoint. Furthermore, one

will notice that having now restricted ourselves to Hilbert space the quadratic form (5.2) is given by

$$Q(f) = \langle Lf, f\rangle. \tag{5.6}$$

One should also note that A is a positive operator since $\langle Af, f\rangle \geq 0$ for any $f \in \ell^2(V)$. Let us denote $\mu_0(L)$ to be the minimum value of the spectrum of L. Recall that this is given by

$$\mu_0(L) = \inf_{f\in\ell^2(V),\ \langle f,f\rangle=1} \langle Lf, f\rangle. \tag{5.7}$$

We define a *ground state* to be a real-valued function ψ on the vertices such that $\psi(x) > 0$ for all $x \in V$ and

$$L\psi = \mu_0(L)\psi. \tag{5.8}$$

It should be noted that even if ϕ exists it does not necessarily lie in $\ell^2(V)$. For a discussion of problems of this type in the continuous setting see, for example, Pinksy [25]. This now leads to the following result from Dodziuk [10] which will be used to demonstrate the stability of the rotating wave solution found in the previous section.

Theorem 5.1 *([10], §2, Theorem 2.1). Consider a discrete elliptic operator $L = P + A$ on a connected graph $G = (V, E)$ where A is positive and symmetric and there exists a constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $P(x) \geq c$ for all $x \in V$. There exists a ground state ψ for L.*

6 Stability Results

We now turn our discussion back to the rotating wave solution found in Theorem 4.1. We again assume that $\omega = 0$ and focus on the phase-lags, since the stability of a solution with any $\omega \in \mathbb{R}$ will be the same. Moreover, one sees that if $\{\bar{\theta}_{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ is a solution then so is $\{\bar{\theta}_{i,j} + C\}_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ for any constant $C \in \mathbb{R}$ since the system of differential equations is only dependent on the difference between neighbouring elements. To work around this we can take any index, say (i_0, j_0), and fix the value of $\bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}$. Then applying the transformation

$$\bar{\phi}_{i,j} = \bar{\theta}_{i,j} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0} \tag{6.1}$$

for all (i, j) will remove the translational invariance of the solution and pose the problem on the infinite lattice $\Lambda := \mathbb{Z}^2\backslash\{(i_0, j_0)\}$. Notice that (6.1) does not effect the difference between neighbouring elements which are both indexed by elements of Λ since we have

$$|\bar{\phi}_{i',j'} - \bar{\phi}_{i,j}| = |(\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}) - (\bar{\theta}_{i,j} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0})| = |\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i,j}|. \tag{6.2}$$

This contrasts with the case of an index which is a nearest-neighbour of (i_0, j_0) since we now have

$$|\bar{\theta}_{i'_0,j'_0} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}| = |\bar{\phi}_{i'_0,j'_0}|. \tag{6.3}$$

The linearization of (4.1) about the phase-lags, which we denote L, allows us to decompose this operator into the sum of two distinct operators acting on a yet to be specified sequence space with elements indexed by Λ. That is, for $x = \{x_{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\Lambda}$ we write $L = P + A$ where

$$(Ax)_{i,j} = \sum_{(i',j')\cap\Lambda} H'(\bar{\phi}_{i',j'} - \bar{\phi}_{i,j})(x_{i',j'} - x_{i,j}), \tag{6.4}$$

and

$$(Px)_{i,j} = \begin{cases} -H'(-\bar{\phi}_{i,j})x_{i,j} & : (i,j) = (i_0 \pm 1, j_0), (i_0, j_0 \pm 1) \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6.5}$$

Hence, one sees that $-L$ is a discrete elliptic operator over a graph whose vertices lie in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of Λ. The reason we say that $-L$ is a discrete elliptic operator and not L is that the order of the differences in A is the reverse of a standard graph Laplacian operator. In this case the weight function $w : \Lambda \times \Lambda \to [0, \infty)$ is given by

$$w((i,j),(k,l)) = \begin{cases} H'(\bar{\phi}_{i',j'} - \bar{\phi}_{i,j}) & : (k,l) \text{ and } (i,j) \text{ are nearest} - \text{neighbours} \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6.6}$$

This is indeed well-defined, since all local interactions are such that $|\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i,j}| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$. More precisely, with the exception of the 'centre' four cells at $(i,j) = (0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)$ all local interactions are such that $|\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i,j}| < \frac{\pi}{2}$, whereas the coupling between any two of the four centre cells is exactly $\pi/2$. In this way we see that the weight function (6.6) is both symmetric and has nonnegative values. Hence, we consider the connected graph with vertex set that lies in one-to-one correspondence with the elements of Λ and an edge set which at least contains all nearest-neighbour connections less those connections between any two of the centre four cells.

Aside: In order for the edge set to contain all nearest-neighbour interactions we require $H'(\pm\frac{\pi}{2}) \neq 0$, although it is not necessary to our work since the graph remains connected in either situation.

From the transformation (6.1) we have shown in (6.3) that the elements $\bar{\phi}_{i'_0,j'_0}$ are given by $\bar{\theta}_{i'_0,j'_0} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}$. Again, since we have remarked that each element $\bar{\theta}_{i,j}$ can have at most two nearest-neighbours such that $|\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i,j}| = \frac{\pi}{2}$, from our transformation (6.1) we have that the operator P must act nontrivially on at least two elements indexed by nearest-neighbours of (i_0, j_0). Indeed, term

$$-H'(-\bar{\phi}_{i'_0,j'_0}) = -H'(\bar{\theta}_{i'_0,j'_0} - \bar{\theta}_{i_0,j_0}) \tag{6.7}$$

can only vanish at a maximum of two indexed nearest-neighbours of (i_0, j_0), meaning that at least two indexed nearest-neighbours of (i_0, j_0) are such that $-H'(\bar{\theta}_{i'_0,j'_0}) \neq 0$. This gives that P acts diagonally and nontrivially.



Figure 5: A possible representation of the underlying graph of the linearization about the rotating wave solution. The vertex set lies in one-to-one correspondence with the indices of the lattice.

Furthermore, one should understand that prior to applying the transformation (6.1) the resulting linearization would merely be a graph Laplacian operator. By applying (6.1) we have effectively reduced this graph Laplacian operator to acting on the subspace of the sequences $x = \{x_{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\mathbb{Z}^2}$ with the property that $x_{i_0,j_0} = 0$. An illustration of this graph in the case that $H'(\pm\frac{\pi}{2}) = 0$ is given in Figure 5 for visualization. In the case that $H'(\pm\frac{\pi}{2}) \neq 0$ the only amendment to Figure 5 is that the edges connecting the centre four vertices will be present.

Proposition 6.1. *$L : \ell^2(\Lambda) \to \ell^2(\Lambda)$ has a bounded inverse.*

Proof. First we show that L is a bounded operator on $\ell^2(\Lambda)$. Indeed, since we can decompose $L = A + P$, proving each component, A and P, are bounded operators will show that L is a bounded operator. Following Remark 1.3 of [10], a graph Laplacian is a bounded operator on $\ell^2(\Lambda)$ whenever there exists a finite uniform bound to the number of vertices connected via an edge to any one vertex of the graph and if the weight function has a uniform upper bound. In our present situation $-A$ is a graph Laplacian such that each vertex is connected to at most four other vertices (its nearest-neighbours) and the fact that the weight function (6.6) is uniformly bounded follows from a direct application of the Extreme Value Theorem since $|\bar{\theta}_{i',j'} - \bar{\theta}_{i,j}| \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ for every local interaction over the lattice. Therefore, $-A$ is a bounded operator, thus making A a bounded operator as well. Finally, P is a diagonal operator which effects a maximum of four indices of the lattice, therefore making it a bounded operator acting on $\ell^2(\Lambda)$.

Now since L is a symmetric operator its spectrum lies in the real numbers. This leads one to observe that

$$\langle -Lx, x\rangle = \sum_{i_0',j_0'} H'(\bar{\phi}_{i_0',j_0'})|x_{i_0',j_0'}|^2 + \sum_{(i,j)\in\Lambda}\sum_{(i',j')\cap\Lambda} H'(\bar{\phi}_{i',j'} - \bar{\phi}_{i,j})|x_{i',j'} - x_{i,j}|^2 \geq 0, \quad (6.8)$$

for every $x \in \ell^2(\Lambda)$ since H' is positive for all such interactions. Taking the infimum of (6.8) over all elements $x \in \ell^2(\Lambda)$ such that $\langle x, x\rangle = 1$ shows that $\mu_0(-L) \geq 0$, using the notation of (5.7). That is, the spectrum of the operator $-L$ lies in the nonnegative real numbers and therefore the spectrum of L lies in the nonpositive real numbers.

Let us now assume that 0 belongs to the spectrum of L. Since $-L$ is a discrete elliptic operator (with $-P \geq 0$) and its spectrum lies in one-to-one correspondence with that of L, Theorem 5.1 implies that there exists an element $\psi = \{\psi_{i,j}\}_{(i,j)\in\Lambda}$ such that $\psi_{i,j} > 0$ and $-L\psi = 0$. Again, we note that ϕ does not necessarily belong to $\ell^2(\Lambda)$, but using (6.8) above we get

$$\langle -L\psi, \psi\rangle = 0. \quad (6.9)$$

From (6.8) the only way in which this can happen is when ψ is such that $A\psi = 0$ and $P\psi = 0$ independently. Since our graph is connected, we see that the only way to have $A\psi = 0$ is when ψ is a constant function on the vertices. Furthermore, since P is a nontrivial, diagonal operator it follows that in order to have $P\psi = 0$ at least one $\psi_{i,j}$ must be zero. Thus, $\psi = 0$, a contradiction. □

Corollary 6.2. *There exists an $\varepsilon > 0$ such that the spectrum of the operator $L : \ell^2(\Lambda) \to \ell^2(\Lambda)$ is contained in the interval $(-\infty, -\varepsilon]$.*

Proof. Recall that the spectrum of a bounded operator is closed and bounded. Then, from Proposition 6.1 and its proof we have that

$$\sigma := \sup_{x\in\ell^2(V),\ \langle x,x\rangle=1} \langle Lx, x\rangle < 0. \quad (6.10)$$

Therefore, the spectrum of L lies in the interval $(-\infty, \sigma]$. □

Hence, we see that using the underlying graph structure $L : \ell^2(\Lambda) \to \ell^2(\Lambda)$ possesses a spectral gap, which in turn implies that the rotating wave solution persists under sufficiently small perturbations in $\ell^2(\Lambda)$. This approach directly parallels that which is undertaken by Ermentrout in [11] where a general theorem on the stability of solutions to finite coupled networks is given. It is apparent that the underlying graph structure of coupled networks, be it finite or infinite, is crucial for both understanding how solutions can be found and their stability. An important distinction that is unique to having an infinite number of oscillators is that stability is dependent on the underlying space in which the problem is posed on. To illustrate this fact the following proposition is presented.



Figure 6: A visualization of two vectors from the sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ from the proof of Proposition 6.3. Here we have $n = 4, 5$ centred at the deleted index (i_0, j_0).

Proposition 6.3. *$L : \ell^\infty(\Lambda) \to \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ does not have a bounded inverse.*

Proof. We recall that the norm on $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ is given by

$$||x||_\infty = \sup_\Lambda |x_{i,j}| < \infty. \tag{6.11}$$

Then to show that L does not have a bounded inverse, we show that it is not bounded below. That is, we show that there does not exists a $\delta > 0$ such that $||Lx||_\infty \geq \delta ||x||_\infty$ for all $x \in \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$. We do this by constructing a sequence $\{x^{(n)}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \subset \ell^\infty(\Lambda)$ such that $||x^{(n)}||_\infty = 1$ for all $n \geq 1$ but $||Lx^{(n)}||_\infty \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$.

The sequence of vectors is constructed in the following way: Begin by fixing $n \geq 1$. For those indices which are one step along the integer lattice $\mathbb{Z}^2$ (nearest-neighbours) to (i_0, j_0) we set the elements of the vector with these indices to $1/n$. Then we set the eight elements which are two steps from the index (i_0, j_0) (nearest-neighbours of the nearest-neighbours) to $2/n$. Next we set the twelve elements which are three steps from the index (i_0, j_0) to $3/n$. We continue this pattern so that for any $k \leq n$ we set those elements which are exactly k steps from the index (i_0, j_0) to k/n. For the remaining elements of whose indices lie at more than n steps from the index (i_0, j_0) we set to 1. Two vectors of this form are shown in Figure 6 for $n = 4, 5$ to visualize the form and demonstrate how the vectors change as n increases.

Then clearly for each n this vector has norm 1 in $\ell^\infty(\Lambda)$, but one should notice that by construction we have

$$|x_{i',j'} - x_{i,j}| \leq \frac{1}{n} \tag{6.12}$$

for any (i,j) and a nearest-neighbour (i',j') in Λ. Furthermore,

$$(Px^{(n)})_{i,j} = \begin{cases} \frac{-H'(-\bar{\psi}_{i,j})}{n} & : (i,j) = (i_0 \pm 1, j_0), (i_0, j_0 \pm 1) \\ 0 & : \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \tag{6.13}$$

which approaches the zero operator as $n \to \infty$. Similarly,

$$|(Ax^{(n)})_{i,j}| \leq \sum_{(i',j') \cap \Lambda} H'(\bar{\psi}_{i',j'} - \bar{\psi}_{i,j}) |x^{(n)}_{i',j'} - x^{(n)}_{i,j}| \leq \frac{4}{n} \cdot \max_{z \in [\frac{-\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]} H'(z) \tag{6.14}$$

for all $(i,j) \in \Lambda$. Therefore $||Lx^{(n)}||_\infty \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, showing that L is not bounded below and completing the proof. □

The results of Proposition 6.3 show that vectors with sufficiently large norm can be mapped to vectors with sufficiently small norms since the linearization L only takes into account the difference between nearest-neighbours. It is for this reason that possibly the classical sequence spaces are not necessarily the appropriate setting for problems of this type. That is, perturbations in $\ell^2(\Lambda)$ leave oscillators far from the centre of rotation relatively unchanged and therefore cannot account for the typical problems asked when considering systems of this type, particularly what the effect of breaking the odd symmetry of H is. Due to the underlying graph structure and how it effects the operator L it seems that a more appropriate spatial setting would be the sequence spaces of bounded variation or the so-called Energy spaces of Jorgensen and coworkers [20, 21]. The questions of spatial setting primarily remains one that is problem dependent, much like the analogous work in spatially continuous PDEs.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by an Ontario Graduate Scholarship. The author is very thankful of Benoit Dionne and Victor LeBlanc for their careful reading of the paper, correcting errors and making improvements to properly convey the results.

References

[1] M. Ablowitz and A. Zeppetella. Explicit solutions of Fisher's equation for a special wave speed, *B. Math. Biol.* **41** (1971), 835-840.

[2] I. Aranson and L. Kramer. The world of the complex Ginzburg-Landau equation, Phys. Mod. Phys. **74** (1998), 99-143.

[3] D. Barkley and I. G. Kevrekidis. A dynamical systems approach to spiral wave dynamics, *Chaos* **4**, (1994) 453-460.

[4] J. Beaumont, N. Davidenko, J. Davidenko and J. Jalife. Spiral waves in two-dimensional models of ventricular muscle: formation of a stationary core, *Biophysical Journal* **75** (1998), 1-14.

[5] P. Brazhnik and J. Tyson. On traveling wave solutions of fishers equation in two-spatial dimensions, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **60** (2000), 371-391

[6] J. Cahn. Theory of crystal growth and interface motion in crystalline materials, *Acta Metal.* **8** (1960), 554-562.

[7] J. Cahn, J. Mallet-Paret and E. Van Vleck. Traveling wave solutions for systems of ODEs on a two-dimensional spatial lattice, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **59** (1998), 455-493.

[8] D. Cohen, J. Neu and R. Rosales. Rotating spiral wave solutions of reaction-diffusion equations, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **35**, (1978) 536-547.

[9] H. Cook, D. de Fontaine and J. Hillard. A model for diffusion of cubic lattices and its application to the early stages of ordering, *Acta Metal.* **17** (1969), 765-773.

[10] J. Dodziuk. Elliptic operators on infinite graphs, in: *Analysis, Geometry and Topology of Elliptic Operators*, World Sci. Publ, Hackensack, NJ, 2006, 353-368.

[11] G. B. Ermentrout. Stable periodic solutions to discrete and continuum arrays of weakly coupled nonlinear oscillators, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **52** (1992), 1665-1687.

[12] G. B. Ermentrout and N. Kopell. Phase transitions and other phenomena in chains of coupled oscillators, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **50** (1990), 1014-1052.

[13] T. Erneux and G. Nicolis. Propagating waves in discrete bistable reaction-diffusion systems, *Physica D* **67** (1993), 237-244.

[14] W. Firth. Optical memory and spatial chaos, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61** (1988), 329-332.

[15] M. Golubitsky, V. LeBlanc and I. Melbourne. Meandering of the Spiral Tip: An Alternative Approach, *Nonlinear Science* **7**, (1997) 557-586.

[16] J. Guo and C. Wu. Existence and uniqueness of traveling waves for a monostable 2-D lattice dynamical system, *Osaka J. Math.* **45** (2008), 327-346.

[17] L. Howard and N. Kopell. Plane wave solutions in reaction-diffusion equations, *Studies in Appl. Math.* **52**, (1973) 291-328.

[18] C. Hsu and S. Lin. Existence and multiplicity of traveling waves in a lattice dynamical system, *J. Differ. Equations* **164** (2000), 431-450.

[19] S. Hwang, T. Kim and K. Lee. Complex-periodic spiral waves in confluent cardiac cell cultures induced by localized inhomogeneities, *PNAS* **102** (2005), 10363-10368.

[20] P. Jorgensen. Unbounded graph-Laplacians in energy space, and their extensions, *J. Appl. Math. Comput.* **39** (2012), 155-187.

[21] P. Jorgensen and E. Pearse. Spectral reciprocity and matrix representations of unbounded operators, *J. Funct. Anal.* **261** (2011) 749-776.

[22] J. Keener. Propagation and its failure in coupled systems of discrete excitable cells, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **47** (1987), 556-572.

[23] S. Ma and X. Zou. Propagation and its failure in a lattice delayed differential equation with global interaction, *J. Differ. Equations* **212** (2005), 129-190.

[24] J. Paullet and G. B. Ermentrout. Stable rotating waves in two-dimensional discrete active media, *SIAM J. Appl. Math.* **54** (1994), pp. 1720-1744.

[25] R. Pinksy. *Positive Harmonic Functions and Diffusion*, Cambridge University Press, New York, (1995).

[26] G. Rousseau, H. Chaté and R. Kapral. Twisted vortex filaments in the three-dimensional complex Ginzburg-Landau equation, *Chaos* **18** (2008), 026103.

[27] A. Scheel. Bifurcation to spiral waves in reaction-diffusion systems, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **29**, (1998) 1399-1418.

[28] A. Tonnelier. Wave propagation in discrete media, *J. Math. Biol.* **44** (2002), 87-105.

[29] B. Zinner. Existence of traveling wavefront solutions for the discrete Nagumo equation, *J. Differ. Equations* **96** (1992), 1-27.